

cate that they also are doubtful. Israel's security would be better served by strengthening the United Nations and solidifying the world detente. Her long range future depends on her becoming an accepted part of a Semitic Middle East, not an outpost of any superpower. But Fulbright's suggestion, even if it never materializes in a treaty, must give added assurance to Israel that the U.S. will not let her down in a peace settlement. A consensus which extends from Nixon to Fulbright is more assurance than any treaty.

This Time The Arabs Stayed

The peace talks flow from the carefully drawn Nov. 22, 1967, resolution of the Security Council. Its cornerstone is "the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war." The principle is important from the standpoint of world law and its reconciliation with Israeli security needs is not as difficult as may appear at first glance. The problem is eased first of all because the bulk of the inhabited areas taken over by the Israelis in the 1967 war are occupied territories in a double sense. They are occupied by Israeli forces but they are also occupied by Arabs. That occupation is an obstacle to Israeli annexation. The Gaza strip is jammed with refugees from the 1948 and 1956 wars. On the West Bank this time the Arabs did not flee or let themselves be frightened into flight. Gaza and the West Bank together have so many Arabs that their annexation would at once create the binational State which majority Zionist opinion has opposed and—given the higher Arab birthrate—would threaten soon to create what Al Fatah seeks: a Palestine with an Arab majority. The only way to preserve a Jewish state is to relinquish those territories.

This leaves three genuine security problems: the Golan Heights, from which Jewish settlements in the Jordan valley were so long shelled by Arab guerrillas; Sharm El Sheikh, which guards the Tiran straits and Israel's access to the Red Sea; and Latrun, which protects the vital road from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. Some form of demilitarization and international force should be a feasible compromise at the first two points. According to the able Israeli journalist, Victor Cygielman, in

Trading One Insecure Frontier For Another

Surrounded by hostile neighbors, holding down occupied lands inhabited by a million Arabs, plagued by fedayeen attacks and oppressed by the costs of armament, Israel is a desperately insecure nation. That is clear, but it is anything but clear that her present policy of relying on military superiority is ever going to alter the situation. If the Suez frontier does not provide security, what boundaries would? . . . Israel will be secure when and if the Arabs lose the wish to threaten her. Eliminating that wish should be an object worth pursuing from Israel's point of view. As victors the Israelis are in a position to be magnanimous without being suspected of weakness—which is something nations worry about whenever they are thinking of behaving sensibly. But thus far they have shown little inclination to trade their conquests for peace. Instead they cling to the advantages won by their military victory of 1967, a wasting asset. One insecure frontier has been traded for another and all that the future seems to hold is continuing conflict, as threatening to the outside world as it is to the Arabs and Israelis.

—Fulbright on the Middle East Aug. 23.

Le Nouvel Observateur (Aug. 24), the U.S. would not be opposed to rectification of the old Israel-Jordan frontier at Latrun (and the retention by Israel of Kfar Etzion in the hills to the North) if Israel is ready to cede a territory of the same extent to Jordan in a peace settlement. Cygielman reported that Israel was disposed to cede the region of Oum-el-Fakham which is inhabited by Israeli Arabs.

This leaves the problem of Jerusalem. Cygielman says the Rogers proposals would demilitarize Jerusalem, leave the city united but with Israeli police and municipal authorities in the Jewish section and Arab authorities in the Arab. There would be a common council for Greater Jerusalem representing both sides with free access to the Holy Places guaranteed for all. There is no reason why Jerusalem under some such ingenious

(Continued On Page Four)

The Dirty Deal The Army Gives The Draftee in Southeast Asia Finally Revealed

Army draftees were killed in Vietnam last year at nearly double the rate of non-draftee enlisted men. During 1969, Army draftees were being killed in action or wounded at the rate of 234 per 1,000. Draftee deaths were 31 per 1,000. By contrast, Army enlisted volunteers were killed or wounded at a rate of 137 per 1,000, and 17 per 1,000 died.

Draftees comprised 88 per cent of infantry riflemen in Vietnam last year while first-term Regular Army men comprised 10 per cent of the riflemen. The remaining 2 per cent were career Army men . . .

Previously unavailable draftee casualty statistics reveal that over the five years in which Americans have been in combat in Vietnam, draftee casualties (killed and wounded) have run 130 per 1,000 per year and non-draftee casualties have run 84 per 1,000. The Army General Staff prepared the study at the request of *National Journal* . . .

The disparity between draftee and volunteer casualty rates directly reflects the tasks that the Army assigns each group of soldiers. . . . Three-year volunteers have the option of selecting their Army jobs and four out of five make their own choice. In 1970, less than 3 percent have asked to serve in the infantry . . .

An Army general who has served more than two years in Vietnam and who asked anonymity said: "Given the way draftees are used by the Army, it's quite obvious that they'll take the brunt of the casualties. It's very sad, really. But the whole goddam war is very sad." . . .

—From the *National Journal* by its Congressional correspondent, Andrew J. Glass, put into the Congressional

Record Aug. 21 (p. S13935) by Senator Proxmire, author of a pending amendment to the military authorization bill to stop sending draftees to Southeast Asia. The *National Journal* (\$450 a year, 1730 M St NW, Washington D.C.) specializes in in-depth political research. This information on draftees has long been denied not only to the press but to Congress. A CBS broadcast provides a supplementary glimpse of how regular Army men treat themselves:

This is Long Binh Army Post, 16 miles from Saigon. It's one of the biggest American bases in Vietnam, a city of 26,000 men. One sergeant here told me that being in Long Binh was the next best thing to not being in Vietnam at all. But Long Binh, like the rest of Vietnam, is a combat zone—everyone gets combat pay. You can spend your year in Vietnam at Long Binh with very little feeling of a war going on. These are the air-conditioned soldiers. One colonel, the head of information here, has a staff of 45, three of whom put out the headquarters magazine, called "Up Tight." The colonel admits that his 42 other information personnel have very little to do . . .

Many of the combat companies in Vietnam are 40 men under strength. At Long Binh Post there are units with as many as 400 men over strength. Of more than 400,000 Americans in Vietnam, in all only 75,000 men are considered to be combat troops. A disproportionate number of draftees are engaged in direct combat. In the rifle companies, eight out of ten men are draftees. Long Binh has a disproportionate number of career officers and NCO's.

—Morley Safer, CBS News, Long Binh, July 17.

No Firm Peace Possible Without The Palestinian Arabs

(Continued From Page Three)

scheme should not become an open city for Jew and Arab, perhaps some day the joint capital of a Palestinian confederation. The Holy City deserves a solution of imagination and magnanimity. Its present Mayor, Teddy Kolleck, has paved the way by his own liberal and large-minded policies for an evolution of this kind.

A Time Bomb Bound To Explode

The crux of the problem, the key to future peace, lies with the Palestinian Arabs, whether in the occupied territories or in the refugee camps. Unfortunately the Rogers plan does not provide for their representation. Nathan Yalin-Mor, head of the so-called Stern Gang in the Jewish terror against the British in the 1940s, and now one of the leading spokesmen in Israel for Arab-Jewish reconciliation, spoke of this on *Radio Stockholm* Aug. 20. "Without the Palestinians being part of, and partner in, any political settlement, as an autonomous body," Mr. Yalin-Mor said, "no solution will be of lasting value. A new selling out of the Palestinian people would amount to planting a time bomb bound to explode after a few years." Unfortunately, he added, the Arabs in the occupied territories, though they favor Nasser's decision for peace talks, have no representative body. On the other hand those in the refugee camps are under guerrilla leadership which opposed the cease-fire and any kind of compromise. This is the same intransigent and fanatic line which has led Arab resistance into one debacle after another. "The result," Mr. Yalin-Mor said, "may be the same as for the last 50 years: disaster for the Palestinian people and the missing of a promising historical opportunity for national self-determination."

Friends of peace must deeply regret the way in which Mrs. Meir handled questions about the Palestinian Arabs in her appearance on *Face The Nation*. She rejected any idea of talks with them and any responsibility whatsoever for the Arab refugees. She implied that they had only themselves to blame because they had not accepted the 1947 UN partition plan. But how can Mrs. Meir invoke the 1947 partition resolution, the legal basis of Israel's existence, and then ignore the 1948 UN refugee resolution, which is the legal basis of Arab rights to repatriation or compensation?

We know the situation is a complex one for Israel but we wish Mrs. Meir had voiced some sympathy for their plight, some readiness to help, some hope for reconciliation. Her coldness was unworthy of a Jewish leader. It is said that Moses

Israel's Right of Hot Pursuit

Sen. Ribicoff: What if terrorist attacks on Israel mounted from Syria and Jordan continued? Does Israel still retain the legitimate right of self-defense to cross borders to get the attackers who now enjoy the protection of Jordan and Syria?

Sen. Fulbright: First, if Jordan and Syria consented to or harbored this kind of attack, they would be in violation of the Security Council guarantee and I think the Security Council ought to take action. But if they do not, and if the occurrence is a clear violation, Israel of course reserves the right of self-defense if it is attacked. By agreeing to the guarantee and the settlement, they do not give up all rights of self-defense.

Sen. Ribicoff: Suppose Arab attackers flee back to Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria. Does the Senator conceive that Israelis, in hot pursuit, could not cross the borders of Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, or Egypt to get to the terrorist bases in those countries?

Sen. Fulbright: If it is hot pursuit, I think they could do that. But here you raise a difficult factual matter. It is not unlike questions which have been raised with us in recent months in Southeast Asia.

This must be judged by rule of reason. If guerrillas are going back and forth across the borders, I think the rule of reason would say, yes, the Israelis could defend themselves, even to the extent of following the guerrillas across the borders. Then, you get to the question: Suppose they go all the way to Amman; suppose they go to the extent of attacking Jordan. That exceeds hot pursuit. They should not be allowed to use hot pursuit as an excuse to occupy Egypt or Jordan; they should not be allowed to go beyond what a reasonable man would say was repelling an attack.

—In the Senate, August 24.

kept the Jews 40 years in the desert to purge them of the habits acquired in slavery. Leadership, like hers, in 40 years of siege and war, will purge the Jews of the compassion acquired in Exile. While the Palestinian Arabs are beginning in their homelessness to talk like Jews in a new Diaspora*, the Israeli leadership is beginning to sound more and more like unfeeling *goyim*. This reversal of roles is the cruellest prank God ever played on His Chosen People.

* See the burning eloquence of the article by F. Turki, a Palestinian Arab, in the Aug. 10 *Paris Herald-Tribune*.

Why Not Send A Gift Sub To That Boy Or Girl Going Off To College

FOR STONE'S HIDDEN HISTORY

For the enclosed \$7.50 send I. F. Stone's book, *The Hidden History of The Korean War* (Monthly Review Press.)

(To) Name

Street

City Zip..... State.....

Indicate if gift announcement wished ☐

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name

Street

City Zip..... State.....

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly 9/7/70
4420 29th St. N. W., Washington, D. C. 20008

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

4420 29th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20008

Second class

postage paid

at

Washington, D. C.